

Quid Novi

THE MCGILL UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF LAW NEWSLETTER

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1981

Administrative

CORRECTION

- ☒ The HOT SEAT will be reinstituted on Thursday, March 5 at 1:00 O'clock in the Moot Court.

Stud. Soc. Annual Elections

- ☒ Be sure to vote in the Students' Society elections today.
The Students' Society is your campus student government.

Positions to be voted for:

President
Vice-President (Internal)
Vice-President (External)
Board of Governors representative

Referenda: Athletics Fee temporary levy for capital expansion project.
Daily Autonomy

Note: Please be sure to read Wednesday's Daily before voting on the referendum on Daily Autonomy.
The issue is not as clear as the Daily editors would like it to seem, and some of the comments to be printed on Wednesday may show why.

- ☒ Saturday, March 7, 1981, 2:00 p.m. Moot Court

The Faculty of Law presents the 1981 Quebec Bar Prize Moot competition at 2:00 p.m. in the Moot Court on Saturday, March 7, 1981. The problem deals specifically in the area of Corporate Law with the rights of minority shareholders upon an amalgamation squeeze-out. Counsel for Appellants - François Lachaine and Nick Spillane. Counsel for Respondent - Ralph Mastromonaco and Ron Silverson. Members of the Bench are Mr. Justice Brian Dickson of the Supreme Court of Canada, Mr. Justice Marc Beauregard of the Quebec Court of Appeal, and Mr. Justice James K. Huguessen of the Quebec Superior Court.

- ☒ Avis aux étudiants de première et deuxième année qui sont intéressés à travailler à la Revue de droit de McGill:

Les membres du journal aimeraient rencontrer les personnes intéressées, le mercredi, 18 mars à 13:00 heure, dans le Common Room. Nous vous encourageons fortement à venir rencontrer les comités de rédaction et d'administration et vous familiariser avec le processus de publication du journal.

To all first and second year students interested in working on the McGill Law Journal:

The Journal Staff would like to invite you to a get-together in the Common Room on Wednesday, 18 March at 1:00 P.M. Come and meet the present Editorial and Management Boards and see how the Journal is put together.

- ☒ BOOKSTORE NOTICE

1) Last day to special order texts is this Friday, March 6th.

2) We will be returning textbooks to the publishers in the next two weeks so if you need any texts for this term BUY THEM NOW!

TERS

The most remarkable aspect of today's day of silence is the failure of students wholeheartedly to support it. Hopefully there will be general albeit often reluctant compliance. Much as faculty may enjoy our difficulty in taking concerted action, they have scant grounds for comfort.

The simple fact is that student antipathy toward faculty is, if anything, increasing. This may come as no small surprise to faculty members who have, after all, yielded to a number of student initiatives this year. Students have some grounds for satisfaction. Unfortunately, however, it is these very gains we have made that have probably stimulated the defensiveness, if not the paranoia of some faculty members to the extent of defeating as innocuous a measure as the increase of student representation from four to six.

Many students do not feel the issue of representation, as placed before faculty, is sufficiently important or relevant to warrant a strong student response. Yet last Wednesday's assembly demonstrated clearly that many students are outraged about the decision. The real issue is faculty's paternalistic attitude toward the student body. Faculty did not consider the issue; it reacted to it and against it. Until faculty can deal with student proposals with respect, and without condescension, it can expect resistance.

Many students also feel the day of silence is ineffectual. Whatever may be the legalities of the vote taken at last assembly, the overwhelming feeling was not for a merely symbolic day of protest, but for a truly effective way of pressuring faculty. The day of silence should be seen then as just a beginning, notice to faculty that we will not succumb to whatever they decide for us. The important thing is that a beginning is being made.

There is and has been a pervasive attitude throughout the school, especially among the student body, either that confrontation between students and faculty must be avoided at all costs, or that it is not possible. There is no question it is unpleasant -- as today will probably demonstrate. On the other hand, however, students have earned over the past years a voice in the decisions which affect them. When we exercise our voice reasonably, we deserve to be respected, and when we feel we are not, we must be prepared to protest effectively. In other words, we must be prepared to confront faculty if we have to.

Peter Dauph

SOCIAL LAW CONFERENCE.

Next Friday will be held in the Moot Court the law students conference on social law organised by students from UQAM, U. of Montréal and McGill. Will be discussed the following themes: "Jurist's formation versus collectivity's needs in social law" during the morning, and "Jurist's formation versus alternatives of practicing law" in the afternoon.

Our panellists:

Morning session: - Bernard Blanchard, bâtonnier of Quebec;
- J.E.C. Brierley, Dean of the McGill Faculty of Law;
- Roland Cousineau, from the
Juridical Sciences Department of UQAM;
- Hélène Dumont, Associate-dean of
the Université de Montréal, Faculty of Law;
- Andrée Lajoie, author of a report about the
jurist's formation, from Université de Montréal.

Afternoon session: - Jules Barrière, director of
Legal aid services in Outaouais;
- Lucille Brisson, director of
the Pointe St-Charles Legal Aid Clinic;
- Jean-Yves Joannette, from the
"Comité-Logement Centre-Sud";
- Roderick MacDonald, from the
McGill Faculty of Law;
- Bernard Vallée, from the
"Centre de documentation populaire".

Following the speakers' interventions, the panel will be open to questions and comments from everybody. The conference will begin at 9:30 a.m. A buffet will be open at 12:30 for only \$2.00. We are looking with enthusiasm for everybody's participation.

Luc Drouin.

PERDU*****

S.V.P Ramener mon briquet en argent au S.A.O. Mon prénom y est inscrit: 'Renée'. Merci.



People

EDITORIALS

The GAZETTE, Montreal, Monday, March 2, 1981

Francis

Give Dawson a home

Dawson has a legitimate beef. The provincial government has been shafting Dawson for a full decade, frustrating annual demands for a permanent home, something that should be a right of every educational institution.

This year, as usual, he is in the utterly mad position of having to educate 6,500 fulltime studs in seven different locations scattered about the city. The locations themselves are often a disgrace — dingy, rundown office building, for example, and a converted factory. In June, leases on four buildings will expire — which might be cause for thanksgiving except for the chilling fact there are no better places for Dawson to go to.

In short, Dawson — lacking a facility as elementary as a central library — is after 12 years' existence still a homeless waif. Or more likely, a homeless giant.

This dubious distinction was underlined last week when, in an understandable fit of impatience, Dawson

held a news conference to say he was still getting the bureaucratic run-around.

He had been told last month by the Ministry of Education that it had approved in

principle the centralization of Dawson's activities at a magnificent site he has had an eye on for years: The massive motherhouse of the Congregation Notre-Dame at Atwater and Sherbrooke Sts.

But the bad news was that the Quebec Treasury Board wouldn't give Dawson money to acquire the site until, a vaguely defined "study" had been made.

47 site studies have already been made over the years. And he speculated further study could mean further delay: In early 1979 he received word from the education ministry that \$25 million would arrive shortly pending Treasury Board approval. He's still waiting.

An education ministry spokesman has since told *The Gazette* the Treasury Board wants to study the cost of purchase and renovation of the motherhouse.

Resolution of this issue is hampered by an evident communications gap. Education Minister Camille Laurin should invite representatives of Dawson, the Treasury Board and Congregation Notre-Dame to meet and sign an agreement. Then, quickly, Dawson should call the moving vans.

DEAR BORA,

I have recently received a new mandate to lead my party in the House of Commons. Despite my new-found confidence I feel that I must forcibly demonstrate my leadership ability and political poise. This desire has become especially acute due to the stubborn refusal of the party in power to give effect to my proposals for the upcoming constitutional reform. What strategy should I adopt to ensure a more thorough consideration of my initiatives?

Signed,

J. Who

Dear Mr. Who,

If your opponents refuse to listen to your reasonable arguments you should plan a day of silence. Abstain from voting on any issue and remain silent during Question Period. This action will undeniably win respect and praise from the opposite side of the Commons -- your silence will show them that you have an important view to be heard. However you should be warned that this procedure, although often effective, can backfire. The most renown example is the Russian boycott of the United Nations meeting during the Korean War which approved UN intervention on the side of South Korea.